

Centralizers in the Group of Interval Exchange Transformations

Daniel Bernazzani

Abstract

Let T be an m -interval exchange transformation. By the rank of T we mean the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space spanned by the lengths of the exchanged subintervals. We prove that if T satisfies Keane's infinite distinct orbit condition and $\text{rank}(T) > 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ then the only interval exchange transformations which commute with T are its powers. The main step in our proof is to show that the centralizer of T is torsion-free under the above hypotheses.

1 Introduction

An interval exchange transformation (IET) is a bijective map $T : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ defined by partitioning the unit interval $[0, 1)$ into finitely many subintervals and then rearranging these subintervals by translation.

The set of all IETs forms a group $\mathbb{G}$ under composition. Given $T \in \mathbb{G}$, let $C(T)$ denote the centralizer of T and let $\langle T \rangle$ denote the cyclic subgroup generated by T . Novak [5] proved that, under some mild hypotheses on T , the quotient $C(T)/\langle T \rangle$ is finite. However, there are examples of IETs which satisfy the hypotheses of Novak's theorem but for which $C(T)/\langle T \rangle$ is nontrivial.

In this paper, we will show that for a typical IET T , we have $C(T) = \langle T \rangle$. Recall that an IET T is said to be minimal if for each $x \in [0, 1)$, the orbit $\mathcal{O}_T(x) = \{T^n(x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is dense in $[0, 1)$. Recall also that an IET is said to be of rotation type if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $T(x) = x + \alpha \pmod{1}$ for all $x \in [0, 1)$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let T be a minimal IET which is not of rotation type. Suppose that the lengths of the exchanged subintervals are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then $C(T) = \langle T \rangle$.*

Theorem 1.1 is a special case of a more general result which will be stated in the third section of this paper.

We will denote n -fold compositions $T \circ \dots \circ T$ by T^n . We will say that T has an n^{th} root in $\mathbb{G}$ if there exists $S \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $T = S^n$. If T is minimal,

then the existence of a n^{th} root for some $n \geq 2$ implies that $C(T) \neq \langle T \rangle$. In a previous paper [1], the author proved that IETs typically do not have nontrivial roots. In particular, the following was proven.

Theorem 1.2. *Let T be an IET satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1. Then T does not have an n^{th} root in $\mathbb{G}$ for any $n \geq 2$.*

Though the non-existence of roots is weaker than the statement that $C(T) = \langle T \rangle$, our proofs of the results in this paper depend on the results in [1].

In addition to the papers already mentioned, there have been several other recent papers which concern the group $\mathbb{G}$. Novak [6] classified continuous one parameter flows in $\mathbb{G}$. Vorobets [9] gave several characterizations of the commutator subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$. Boshernitzan [2] characterized the subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$ generated by finite order elements and rotations. There is also a longstanding open question regarding $\mathbb{G}$: could a subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$ be isomorphic to a non-abelian free group? Novak [7] showed that certain elements of $\mathbb{G}$ cannot belong to such a subgroup. Dahmani, Fujiwara, and Guirardel [3] proved that non-abelian free subgroups of $\mathbb{G}$ are rare if they do exist.

2 Rank and Admissibility

In this section we introduce some definitions and notation which will allow us to properly state our results. We begin by giving the formal definition of an IET. The permutation group of the set $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ will be denoted by S_m .

Definition 2.1. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\pi \in S_m$ and let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m)$ be a vector in the simplex

$$\Delta_m = \left\{ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \lambda_i > 0, \sum_i \lambda_i = 1 \right\}.$$

Let

$$\beta_0 = 0 \text{ and } \beta_j = \sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

The set $\{\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}$ partitions $[0, 1)$ into m subintervals of the form $I_j = [\beta_{j-1}, \beta_j)$. Define $T_{(\pi, \lambda)} : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ by

$$T_{(\pi, \lambda)}(x) = x - \left(\sum_{i < j} \lambda_i \right) + \left(\sum_{\pi(i) < \pi(j)} \lambda_i \right), \text{ for } x \in I_j.$$

The map $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ rearranges the intervals I_j by translation according to the permutation π . We will refer to any map constructed in this manner as an m -IET. For convenience, we sometimes drop the reference to π and λ and simply denote the map $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ by T .

The next definition is central to our work.

Definition 2.2. Let T be an IET. Let $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \dots < \gamma_{m-1}$ be the points at which T is discontinuous. Let $\gamma_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_m = 1$. Let $l_j = \gamma_j - \gamma_{j-1}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. We will refer to the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space spanned by $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_m$ as the *rank* of T . This will be denoted by $\text{rank}(T)$.

There is a subtlety related to definition 2.2: the data (π, λ) which goes into the definition of an IET does not always reflect the number of discontinuities. The discontinuities $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ are clearly contained in the set $\{\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{m-1}\}$. However, it is possible that T is continuous at some of these points. Whether or not T is continuous at these points depends on the permutation π . More specifically, if $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, then $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ is discontinuous at β_i if and only if $\pi(i+1) \neq \pi(i) + 1$. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 2.3. We will say that $\pi \in S_m$ is *admissible* if $\pi(i+1) \neq \pi(i) + 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$.

For example, the permutation $\tau = (4213) \in S_4$ is admissible, while the permutation $\sigma = (4231) \in S_4$ is not. The following result, which is proven in [1], shows that there is no loss of generality in only considering IETs defined by admissible permutations.

Proposition 2.1. *Let T be an IET with precisely $m-1$ discontinuities. There exists an admissible permutation $\pi \in S_m$ and a vector $\lambda \in \Delta_m$, both of which are unique, such that $T = T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$.*

If $T_{(\pi, \lambda)}$ is an m -IET defined by an admissible permutation $\pi \in S_m$, then the discontinuities of T are precisely the points $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{m-1}$, so $\text{rank}(T)$ is equal to the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space spanned by $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m$. If, however, π is not admissible, then $\text{rank}(T_{(\pi, \lambda)})$ is not necessarily equal to the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space spanned by $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m$.

3 The Centralizer of a Typical IET

It is entirely possible that the centralizer

$$C(T) = \{S \in \mathbb{G} : ST = TS\}$$

of a minimal IET T is uncountable. Indeed, if T is a minimal 2-IET with permutation (21), then there exists some irrational $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that T acts on $[0, 1)$ by $x \mapsto x + \alpha \pmod{1}$. Any two such maps commute with one another, so $C(T)$ is uncountable.

Remark 3.1. In fact, for any $m \geq 2$ there exist examples of minimal m -IETs which have an uncountable centralizer. The examples given on page 7 of [1] have this property.

Though the above examples might suggest otherwise, it is unusual for a minimal IET to have a large centralizer. If $T \in \mathbb{G}$, let $d(T^n)$ denote the number of discontinuities of T^n . Novak [5] showed that for a given $T \in \mathbb{G}$, there are only two possibilities for the growth rate of $d(T^n)$: the sequence $d(T^n)$ is either bounded independently of n or else grows linearly in n . In the case of linear growth, Novak showed that $C(T)$ cannot be too large. See Proposition 5.3 of [5] for the proof of the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *(Novak) Suppose that T is minimal and $d(T^n)$ grows linearly in n . Then $\langle T \rangle$ has finite index in $C(T)$.*

In this paper, we will make use of a special case of Novak's result. We need the following definition.

Definition 3.1. Let T be an m -IET. Let $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{m-1}$ be as in Definition 2.1. We say that T satisfies the infinite distinct orbit condition (i.d.o.c.) if each of the orbits $\mathcal{O}_T(\beta_1), \mathcal{O}_T(\beta_2), \dots, \mathcal{O}_T(\beta_{m-1})$ is infinite and $\mathcal{O}_T(\beta_i) \cap \mathcal{O}_T(\beta_j) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.

The infinite distinct orbit condition was originally formulated by Keane, who showed that any IET which satisfies it and exchanges two or more intervals is minimal [4].

As Novak indicates (see page 2 of [5]), any IET T satisfying the i.d.o.c. will exhibit linear discontinuity growth, provided that T is not a 2-IET. This implies the following.

Corollary 3.1. *(Novak) Let $m \geq 3$. Suppose that T is an m -IET defined by an admissible permutation. If T satisfies the i.d.o.c., then $\langle T \rangle$ has finite index in $C(T)$.*

Proof. By the above, it suffices to show that T is not a 2-IET. This follows from the assumption that $m \geq 3$ and that T is defined by an admissible permutation. ■

If an IET satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1, then $C(T)$ is countable. However, it is not necessarily true that $C(T) = \langle T \rangle$. For example, let S be an IET satisfying the hypotheses of Corollary 3.1. Let $T = S^n$ for some $n \geq 2$. Then it is not hard to see that T satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1, but $C(T) \neq \langle T \rangle$, since $S \in C(T)$ and $S \notin \langle T \rangle$.

As the preceding example shows, one obstruction to having $C(T) = \langle T \rangle$ is the existence of a n^{th} root for some $n \geq 2$. In a previous paper [1], the author showed that most IETs do not have nontrivial roots. In particular, the following result was proven. Notice that if T is an m -IET defined by an admissible permutation, then $1 \leq \text{rank}(T) \leq m$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let T be a minimal m -IET defined by an admissible permutation. Suppose that $\text{rank}(T) > 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. Then T does not have an n^{th} root in $\mathbb{G}$ for any $n \geq 2$.*

A second obstruction to having $C(T) = \langle T \rangle$ is the presence of torsion in $C(T)$. For example, let S be an 3-IET which is defined by an admissible permutation and which satisfies the i.d.o.c. By rescaling, we can imagine S acting on $[0, \frac{1}{2})$ while leaving the interval $[\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ fixed. Let P be the 2-IET of order two which interchanges $[0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $[\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. The map PSP acts on $[\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ as a 3-IET and leaves $[0, \frac{1}{2})$ fixed. Since the supports of S and PSP are disjoint, S and PSP commute with one another. Consider the map $T = PSPSP = SPS$. It is not difficult to see that T is minimal. It is also not hard to see that $d(T^n) \sim 4n$, so T exhibits linear discontinuity growth. However, P commutes with T and $P \notin \langle T \rangle$, since T has infinite order. Hence $C(T) \neq \langle T \rangle$.

In the present work, we establish a condition which guarantees that $C(T)$ is torsion-free.

Theorem 3.3. *Let T be an m -IET defined by an admissible permutation. Suppose that T satisfies the i.d.o.c. and that $\text{rank}(T) > 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. Then the only element of $C(T)$ which has finite order is the identity.*

The proof of Theorem 3.3 will be given in the next section of this paper. We will now establish the main result of this paper by combining Corollary 3.1 with Theorems 3.2 and 3.3.

Theorem 3.4. *Let T be an m -IET defined by an admissible permutation. Suppose that T satisfies the i.d.o.c. and that $\text{rank}(T) > 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. Then $C(T) = \langle T \rangle$.*

Proof. Let $S \in C(T)$. By Corollary 3.1, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S^n \in \langle T \rangle$, say $S^n = T^m$.

We will prove that $S \in \langle T \rangle$ by induction on n . If $n = 1$ there is nothing to prove. Suppose that $n \geq 2$. Let p be a prime dividing n , say $n = up$. Write $m = qp + r$, where $0 \leq r < p$. We claim that $r = 0$. If not, then there exists k such that $kr \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, say $kr = 1 + tp$. Then

$$S^{upk} = S^{nk} = T^{mk} = T^{kqp+kr} = T^{kqp+tp+1}.$$

Since T commutes with S it follows that $(S^{uk}T^{-(kq+t)})^p = T$. This contradicts Theorem 3.2. Therefore $r = 0$ and $m = qp$. Hence $S^{up} = S^n = T^m = T^{qp}$. By rearranging, we see that $(S^uT^{-q})^p = I$, where I denotes the identity map. By Theorem 3.3, $S^uT^{-q} = I$. Therefore $S^u = T^q$. Since $u < n$, it follows by induction that $S \in \langle T \rangle$. ■

Finally, we observe that Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let T be a minimal IET which is not of rotation type. Suppose that the lengths of the exchanged subintervals are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $m-1$ be the number of discontinuities of T . The assumption that T is not of rotation type implies that T has at least two discontinuities. So $m \geq 3$. Choose $\lambda \in \Delta_m$ according to Proposition 2.1. The assumption that the lengths

of the exchanged subintervals are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ implies that the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space spanned by $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m$ is m . According to a well-known result of Keane [4], T satisfies the i.d.o.c. Moreover, by the remarks following Proposition 2.1, $\text{rank}(T) = m$. Since $m \geq 3$, $\text{rank}(T) > 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, so Theorem 3.4 implies that $C(T) = \langle T \rangle$. ■

4 Proof of Theorem 3.3

This section is divided into several subsections. In the first two, we briefly explain some machinery which will be used in our proof of Theorem 3.3. The proof itself will be given in the third subsection. Given an IET T , $D(T)$ will denote the set of points at which T is discontinuous.

4.1 The First Return Map

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the set algebra consisting of finite unions of half-open intervals $[a, b)$ contained in $[0, 1)$. If $J \in \mathcal{A}$, let $E(J)$ denote the set of endpoints of the connected components of J . For example, if $J = [0, \frac{1}{3}) \cup [\frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{6})$, then $E(J) = \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{5}{6}\}$. It is well-known that if T is an IET and $J \in \mathcal{A}$ then the first return map to J is an IET. The following lemma is a precise formulation of this fact (see, e.g. section four of [8] for a proof).

Lemma 4.1. *Let T be an IET. Suppose that $J \in \mathcal{A}$ and that $E(J) \cap D(T) = \emptyset$. Let $P \subseteq J$ consist of those points x in the interior of J for which there exists an $n \geq 1$ such that $T^j(x) \notin J \cup D(T) \cup E(J)$ for $0 < j < n$ and $T^n(x) \in D(T) \cup E(J)$. The set P is finite. Therefore $P \cup E(J)$ partitions J into finitely many subintervals $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$. There exist positive integers $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k$ such that*

- (1) *for each i , the restriction of T^{m_i} to J_i is a translation for $1 \leq i \leq k$*
- (2) *for each i , $T^j(J_i) \cap J = \emptyset$ for $0 < j < m_i$*
- (3) *for each i , T^{m_i} translates J_i onto a subinterval of J*
- (4) *the intervals $T^{m_i}(J_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, are pairwise disjoint*

It should be noted that if J is as in Lemma 4.1., then the set $B := \bigcup_{i=1}^k \bigcup_{j=0}^{m_i-1} T^j(J_i)$ is T -invariant (that is, $T(B) = B$). So it must be that $B = [0, 1)$ if T is minimal.

Definition 4.1. Suppose that $J \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 4.3. For each $x \in J$, let $n_J(x) = \inf\{n \geq 1 : T^n(x) \in J\}$. According to the lemma, $n_J(x) = m_i$ for $x \in J_i$. The map $T_J : J \rightarrow J$ defined by $T_J(x) = T^{n_J(x)}(x)$ is the *first return map to J* . The integers $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k$ are the *return times*.

4.2 Fundamental Discontinuities

Suppose that T is minimal. Let $p \in D(T)$ and assume that $T^n(p) \notin D(T)$ for all $n < 0$. Since $\mathcal{O}_T(p)$ is infinite, there exists a smallest positive integer N_p such that $T^n(p) \notin D(T) \cup \{0\}$ for $n \geq N_p$. If T^{N_p} is continuous at p , then all of the iterates T^n for $n \geq N_p$ are continuous at p . On the other hand, if T^{N_p} is discontinuous at p , then all of the iterates T^n for $n \geq N_p$ are discontinuous at p . This dichotomy was originally observed by Novak in his study of the discontinuity growth rate of IETs (see page 7 of [5]). Following Novak, we classify the points in $D(T)$ according to the following scheme:

Definition 4.2. Let T be minimal. We will say that $p \in D(T)$ is a *fundamental discontinuity* if $T^n(p) \notin D(T)$ for all negative n and T^n is discontinuous at p for all sufficiently large positive n . We will denote the set of fundamental discontinuities by $D_f(T)$.

We will need to make use of a fact proven by Novak (see the proof of Proposition 5.3 in [5]).

Lemma 4.2. (Novak) *Suppose that T is minimal and that $S \in C(T)$. Then S permutes the orbits of the fundamental discontinuities of T . More precisely, for each $p \in D_f(T)$, there exists $q \in D_f(T)$ such that $S(\mathcal{O}_T(p)) = \mathcal{O}_T(q)$.*

We will also need the following fact.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that T satisfies the i.d.o.c. Then every discontinuity of T , with the possible exception of $T^{-1}(0)$, is a fundamental discontinuity.*

Proof. Let $p \in D(T)$ and suppose that $p \neq T^{-1}(0)$. Since T satisfies the i.d.o.c., $T^n(p) \notin D(T)$ for all $n < 0$. Let $n \geq 1$. Since T satisfies the i.d.o.c., T is continuous at all points in the forward orbit of p . Since $T(p)$ is contained in the interior of $[0, 1)$, it follows that T^{n-1} is a translation on some open interval containing $T(p)$. Combining this with the fact that T is discontinuous at p , it follows that T^n is discontinuous at p . Since this is true for all $n \geq 1$, p is a fundamental discontinuity of T . ■

4.3 The Proof

The strategy behind our proof of Theorem 3.3 is simple enough, but the details are somewhat cumbersome, so we will explain the main idea first. Suppose that T is a minimal m -IET defined by an admissible permutation. Suppose that $S \in C(T)$ has finite order q . Let $K \subseteq [0, 1)$ be an interval which is small enough so that the translates $K, S(K), \dots, S^{q-1}(K)$ are disjoint. Notice that the set $J := \bigcup_{i=0}^{q-1} S^i(K)$ is S -invariant, since S has order q . Let $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$ be the subintervals of J which are exchanged by the first return map T_J . Let $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_k$ denote the lengths of $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$, respectively. As we will see, the fact that S permutes the orbits of the fundamental discontinuities of T implies

that the first return map T_J to J has a certain q -fold symmetry: there are approximately only k/q different lengths appearing among $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_k$. This will allow us to conclude that $\text{rank}(T)$ is approximately m/q .

The remainder of this section will be spent elaborating on the details of the strategy outlined above.

Lemma 4.4. *Let T be a minimal IET and let $S \in C(T)$. If S has a fixed point, then $S = I$.*

Proof. Let F be the set of fixed points of S . The definition of an IET implies that F is a finite union of half-open intervals. Since T commutes with S , the set F must be T -invariant. Since T is minimal, $F = [0, 1)$. ■

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that T is a minimal IET. Let d_f denote the number of fundamental discontinuities. Let d_{nf} denote the number of discontinuities which are not fundamental. If $S \in C(T)$ has finite order q , then*

(1) q divides d_f

(2) $\text{rank}(T) \leq \frac{d_f}{q} + d_{nf} + 1$

Proof. It follows from Definition 4.2 that distinct fundamental discontinuities must belong to different T -orbits. Therefore Lemma 4.2 implies that the map S induces a $\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$ action on the set $D_f(T)$. Let $g : D_f(T) \rightarrow D_f(T)$ be the map induced by S . To be clear, this means that $g(x)$ is the unique $y \in D_f(T)$ such that $S(x) \in \mathcal{O}_T(y)$.

Since $D_f(T)$ is partitioned into g -orbits, the first claim of the theorem will follow if we can show that each g -orbit has size exactly q .

Let $x \in D_{NR}(T)$. Let $x = x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{q-1}$ be the g orbit of x . We must show that the points $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{q-1}$ are all distinct. To see this, suppose that that $x_i = x_j$ where $0 \leq i < j < q$. Then, by the definition of g , $S^{j-i}(x_i) = T^k(x_i)$ for some k . The map $S^{j-i}T^{-k}$ fixes x_i , so Lemma 4.4 implies that $S^{j-i}T^{-k} = I$. So $S^{j-i} = T^k$. Since T has infinite order, this is a contradiction unless $k = 0$. So $S^{j-i} = I$. Since $0 < j - i < q$ this contradicts the fact that S has order q .

We will now prove the second claim of the theorem. For clarity, suppose first that every discontinuity of T is fundamental.

Let $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k$ be representatives for the distinct g -orbits in $D_f(T) = D(T)$. Thus

$$D(T) = \{g^j(x_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k \text{ and } 0 \leq j \leq q-1\}.$$

By the definition of g , for each pair of integers i, j satisfying $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $0 \leq j < q-1$, there exists an integer $n_{i,j}$ such that $S(g^j(x_i)) = T^{n_{i,j}}(g^{j+1}(x_i))$.

Choose N so that

$$N > 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{q-2} |n_{i,j}|. \quad (1)$$

Let $K = [a, b)$ be some subinterval of $[0, 1)$ such that the restriction of S to each of the sets $S^i(K)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, q-1$ is a translation. By shrinking K , we can assume that each of the sets $S^i(K)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, q-1$ is a connected component of the set $J := \cup_{i=0}^{q-1} S^i(K)$. Since S has order q , J is S -invariant. By shrinking K further, we can assume that none of the points in the set

$$\{T^j(x_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k \text{ and } -N \leq j \leq N\}$$

belong to J .

Let M_1 be the largest negative integer such that $T^{M_1}(x_1) \in J$. Let M_2 be the smallest positive integer such that $T^{M_2}(x_1) \in J$. By construction, $M_1 < -N$ and $M_2 > N$. By shrinking K further, we can assume that the endpoints of the q connected components of J are precisely the points $S^i(T^{M_j}(x_1))$ for $j = 1, 2$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots, q-1$.

Let

$$C_1 = \{T^j(x_1) : M_1 < j < M_2\}.$$

For $i = 2, 3, \dots, k$, let

$$C_i = \{T^j(x_i) : -N \leq j \leq N\}.$$

Each set C_i is just a finite segment of the T -orbit of x_i . By construction, none of the points of $\cup_{i=1}^k C_i$ belong to J . Notice that

$$S(C_1) = \{T^j(g(x_1)) : M_1 + n_{1,0} < j < M_2 + n_{1,0}\}$$

and that

$$S(C_i) = \{T^j(g(x_i)) : -N + n_{i,0} < j < N + n_{i,0}\}$$

for $i = 2, 3, \dots, k$. Thus each set $S(C_i)$ is a finite segment of the T -orbit of $g(x_i)$. Since J is S -invariant, none of the points in $\cup_{i=1}^k S(C_i)$ belong to J . Moreover, a glance at the inequality (1) shows that our choice of N ensures that $g(x_i) \in S(C_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Therefore the discontinuities $g(x_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ do not belong to J . More generally, if $1 \leq v \leq q-1$, then

$$S^v(C_1) = \left\{ T^j(g^v(x_1)) : M_1 + \sum_{r=0}^{v-1} n_{1,r} < j < M_2 + \sum_{r=0}^{v-1} n_{1,r} \right\}$$

and

$$S^v(C_i) = \left\{ T^j(g^v(x_i)) : -N + \sum_{r=0}^{v-1} n_{i,r} < j < N + \sum_{r=0}^{v-1} n_{i,r} \right\}$$

for $i = 2, 3, \dots, k$. Since the set J is S -invariant, none of the points in the set $\cup_{v=0}^{q-1} \cup_{i=1}^k S^v(C_i)$ belong to J . Our choice of N guarantees that $D(T) \subseteq \cup_{v=0}^{q-1} \cup_{i=1}^k S^v(C_i)$. So $J \cap D(T) = \emptyset$.

We now apply Lemma 4.1 to the set J . We claim that the set P described in Lemma 4.1 consists of exactly d_f points. Indeed, if $p \in D_f(T) = D(T)$ then the first point in the backward T -orbit of p which belongs to the interior of J must belong to the set P . Conversely, every point in P arises in this way. Since the orbits of the fundamental discontinuities are distinct, it follows that $|P| = d_f$, as claimed.

Since $|P| = d_f$ and J has exactly q connected components, it follows that $P \cup E(J)$ partitions J into $q + d_f$ subintervals $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_{q+d_f}$. Let $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{q+d_f}$ denote the lengths of $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_{q+d_f}$, respectively. Let $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{q+d_f}$ be the return times for the map T_J . The set $A := \bigcup_{i=1}^{q+d_f} \bigcup_{j=0}^{m_i-1} T^j(J_i)$ is T -invariant. Since T is minimal, it must be that $A = [0, 1)$. Moreover, each of the intervals $T^j(J_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq q + d_f$ and $0 \leq j \leq m_i - 1$ must be contained in one of the intervals on which T is continuous. For if this were not the case, then some $x \in D(T)$ would have to belong to the forward orbit of a point in the interior of one of the intervals J_i . This point would then have to belong to P , a contradiction. It follows that each of the intervals on which are exchanged by T must be a disjoint union of some of the intervals $T^j(J_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq q + d_f$ and $0 \leq j \leq m_i - 1$. These intervals are themselves just translates of the intervals J_i for $1 \leq i \leq q + d_f$. Therefore $\text{rank}(T)$ is at most equal to the number of distinct lengths appearing among $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{q+d_f}$.

We claim that the set P is S -invariant. To see this, note that the points in P are precisely those points in the interior of J whose forward T -orbit encounters one of the segments $S^v(C_i)$ before returning to J . By construction, the forward orbit of a point x encounters a segment or returns to J at exactly the same time that that forward T -orbit of $S(x)$ encounters the segment $S^{v+1}(C_i)$ or returns to J . It follows that $x \in P$ if and only if $S(x) \in P$. In other words, P is S -invariant.

Since the partition $P \cup E(J)$ which determines the intervals $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_{q+d_f}$ is S -invariant, and S acts on the q connected components of J by translation, it follows that there are at most

$$\frac{q + d_f}{q} = \frac{d_f}{q} + 1$$

different lengths appearing among $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{q+d_f}$. By our previous observations, it follows that

$$\text{rank}(T) \leq \frac{d_f}{q} + 1$$

which is exactly what we wanted to show.

In the case when some of the discontinuities are not fundamental, we can proceed as we did above. The only difference is that for each non-fundamental discontinuity, there might be an additional point in the set P . This point divides one of the intervals J_i into two intervals, and increases the rank of T by at most one. Our previous estimate on the rank is therefore increased by at most d_{nf} .

Thus

$$\text{rank}(T) \leq \frac{d_f}{q} + 1 + d_{nf}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let T be an m -IET defined by an admissible permutation. Suppose that T satisfies the i.d.o.c. Assume that $S \in C(T)$ has finite order $q \geq 2$. We have to prove that $\text{rank}(T) \leq 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$.

Since T is defined by an admissible permutation, $D(T) = m - 1$. Lemma 4.3 tells us that there are two possibilities: either $d_f = m - 1$ and $d_{nf} = 0$ or $d_f = m - 2$ and $d_{nf} = 1$. In the first case, Theorem 4.1 tells us that

$$\text{rank}(T) \leq 1 + \frac{m-1}{q} \leq 1 + \frac{m}{2}.$$

Since $\text{rank}(T)$ is an integer, it follows that $\text{rank}(T) \leq 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. In the second case, Theorem 4.1 tells us that

$$\text{rank}(T) \leq 2 + \frac{m-2}{q} \leq 2 + \frac{m-2}{2} = 1 + \frac{m}{2}.$$

Once again, we conclude that $\text{rank}(T) \leq 1 + \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. ■

5 Concluding Remarks

Theorem 3.4 confirms that a typical IET has a trivial centralizer. However, there are still many natural questions concerning centralizers in $\mathbb{G}$ which remain unanswered. For instance, let T be an IET satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4. Could T^2 have a square root different from T ? Does T^2 have torsion in its centralizer? Since T^2 obviously has a square root, Theorem 3.2 implies that T^2 does not satisfy the hypotheses of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4. Therefore the results of this paper do not apparently help answer these questions.

The author believes that both of the questions in the preceding paragraph have a negative answer. In fact, the author thinks it likely that the following is true.

Conjecture 5.1. *Let T be an IET which satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3.4. Then, for any $n \geq 2$, $C(T^n) = C(T) = \langle T \rangle$.*

6 Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Michael Boshernitzan for reading several drafts of this paper and making many helpful suggestions.

References

- [1] D. Bernazzani, Most interval exchanges have no roots, arXiv:1602.02613 (2016).
- [2] M. Boshernitzan, Subgroup of interval exchanges generated by torsion elements and rotations, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **144** (2016), 2565–2573.
- [3] F. Dahmani, K. Fujiwara, V. Guirardel, Free groups of interval exchange transformations are rare, *Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics*, **7** (2013), 883–910.
- [4] M. Keane, Interval exchange transformations, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **141** (1975), 25–31.
- [5] C. Novak, Discontinuity growth of interval exchange maps, *Journal of Modern Dynamics* **3** (2009), 379–405.
- [6] C. Novak, Continuous interval exchange actions, *Algebraic & Geometric Topology* **10** (2010) 1609–1625.
- [7] C. Novak, Interval exchanges that do not embed in free groups, arXiv:1007.3940 (2010).
- [8] M. Viana, Ergodic theory of interval exchange maps, *Revista Matemática Complutense* **19** (2006), 7–100.
- [9] Y. Vorobets, Notes on the commutator group of the group of interval exchange transformations, arXiv:1109.1352 (2011).